

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Tuesday - 7 March 1972

Page 2

4. (Confidential - GLC) Mr. Houston, General Counsel, contacted us regarding the response which should be given by Secretary Rogers to the Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow if he is questioned about Chairman Fulbright's letter to the Department requesting various studies on the Radios. (Secretary Rogers is appearing before the Committee tomorrow in connection with Foreign Aid legislation.) It was agreed that the Secretary should indicate that updated material along the lines of his request has been forwarded to OMB for review and will then be given to the Committee. If the Secretary is pressed for a response about any Agency studies, he should indicate that he will refer the matter to CIA. Mr. Houston is handling this with [redacted] of CA Staff. 25X1A

5. (Confidential - GLC) In following up on a call from Assistant Secretary of State Abshire, to Mr. Maury, I talked with his assistant, Mr. James Halmo. Mr. Halmo said Mr. Abshire was interested in knowing how many CIA studies had been conducted on the Radios. (Abshire wants this information in connection with Secretary Rogers' appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow.) I advised Halmo that our General Counsel was preparing a suggested response for the Secretary on this which would be passed from [redacted] of CIA, to either Dick Davies or John Baker of the State Department. I urged Mr. Halmo to plug into that channel for guidance. 25X1A

6. (Confidential - GLC) Talked with Mr. John Goldsmith, on the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who said that at the Committee hearing this morning a question was put to Ambassador Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, about the possibility of funds for irregular forces in Laos being appropriated to the State Department which would be given by the Ambassador to a member of his country team for payment. Sullivan said this posed a new proposition which he would want to check with his legal people and then make a response to the Committee. (See Mr. Maury's Memo for the Record.)

STATOTHR

STATOTHR

7. (Confidential - JMM) Called Representative James Cleveland (R., N.H.) and reported on the results of my trip to New Hampshire regarding the [redacted] [redacted] He seemed well satisfied.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Tuesday - 7 March 1972

Page 4

STATSPEC 12. (Confidential - JMM) Left at the office of Representative Robert L. F. Sikes a recent [] foreign reactions to the President's China trip, in which Sikes had previously expressed interest.

13. (Confidential - JMM) Left a copy of the China atlas at the office of Representative J. Kenneth Robinson.

14. (Confidential - JMM) Talked to Ed Braswell, Chief Counsel, Senate Armed Services Committee, regarding today's appearance of G. Warren Nutter and Maj. Gen. George Seignious, both of ISA, and Don Brazier, DOD Comptroller, and William H. Sullivan, of State Department on the Defense Procurement Authorization bill. See Memo for Record.

25X1A 15. (Confidential - JMM) David Abshire, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, called to say they were deeply concerned over the possibility that the Secretary would be asked, during his appearance tomorrow before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, about studies concerning RFE and Radio Liberty, and the cost of their termination, which the Committee had requested. I told Abshire that I understood that all concerned had agreed Chairman Fulbright should be provided a copy of the latest study on the termination costs, but I was not familiar with the contents of various other studies concerning the Radios and thought this would have to be discussed between [] of the Agency, and Mr. Baker, of State, who were already in touch in this regard. Abshire suggested that if queried about additional studies the Secretary should refer Fulbright to the Agency. I said I thought we would object to this, since we had washed our hands of the Radios and I thought any contact with the Committee in this regard should be through the Department and Office of Management and Budget. I said I would ask [] to call Mr. Baker immediately, which I did.

25X1A [] called me after having talked to Mr. Baker and said he and Baker had agreed that, if pressed by Fulbright for additional studies other than the one on termination costs, the Secretary should simply say that he would have to take this up with the Agency. [] said 25X1A Mr. Baker apparently had not been successful in selling this solution to Mr. Abshire.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

#5

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY
March 6, 1972

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT
CONCERNING REPORTS ON RADIO FREE EUROPE & RADIO LIBERTY
PREPARED BY THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

MR. PRESIDENT, the Library of Congress has completed its reports on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The reports were delivered to the Committee on Foreign Relations on Friday, March 3, at 5:00 p.m.

In view of the controversy surrounding these reports and the allegations that I and members of the Committee staff have tried to suppress this information or alter its presentation, I ask unanimous consent to have the reports, plus my correspondence with the Library, included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. The appendices to the reports, numbering several hundred additional pages, are in the Committee's files and are available to the public, as are the draft versions of the reports.

Mr. President, this work is the result of a request which I sent to the Library on June 8, 1971. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Charles Gellner, Chief, Foreign Affairs Division, and Mr. James Price, Analyst in National Defense, both of the Library of Congress met with Mr. Robert Dockery of the Committee staff for the purpose of discussing the request. Following this meeting, Mr. Dockery was informed by the Library that two studies would be prepared, one on each of the Radios, that Mr. Price would be responsible for the Radio Free Europe study and that Dr. Joseph Whelan, Specialist in Soviet and East European Affairs of the Library, would be responsible for the Radio Liberty study. At approximately the same time, Mr. Dockery was informed that, at Mr. Price's suggestion, an independent consultant, specialized in audience research analysis techniques, would be brought in to evaluate the Radios' audience-response claims.

At my request, the Library agreed to include in the final reports a resume on each of the research participants.

The researchers completed their drafts during the first part of January and Mr. Gellner forwarded them to Mr. Dockery on January 14. In his transmittal memo, Mr. Gellner clearly identified the status of the reports by noting:

"We will be happy to have your comments before we put the studies into final shape and formally transmit them. Our review of these drafts has not yet been completed and we too will wish to make some changes."

-2-

Mr. Dockery reviewed the drafts and in preparation for the initial House-Senate conference on S.18, he prepared a background memorandum, dated January 21, for the Senate conferees in which he summed up the reports' findings in the following way:

"Preliminary versions of the Library's studies are now completed and are complimentary to the Radios' efforts to breach the censorship imposed on the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The studies do make it clear, however, that the Eastern bloc countries and the U.S.S.R. are strongly opposed to these broadcast activities."

The same information was available to the staff of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who were briefed by the Library's researchers prior to the House-Senate conference on January 26.

On February 2, Mr. Dockery met with Messrs. Gellner, Price and Whelan to discuss the draft reports. His comments suggested that the draft reports were deficient in several key respects, such as neglecting the origins of and reasons for the Government's decision to establish and fund the Radios. Mr. Dockery also suggested that the researchers may have placed too much reliance on the public information handouts provided by the Radio organizations themselves -- organizations which I might point out still refuse to acknowledge publicly any ties to the U.S. intelligence community.

The validity of these comments was, of course, a matter for the Library's staff to judge, and I wish to emphasize that at no time did I or anyone connected with the Committee on Foreign Relations attempt to direct the Library's research effort or to influence the findings and recommendations developed from it.

In this regard, I might point out that the final reports are substantially the same as the original drafts and, although the Library indicates that it is prepared to undertake two additional studies which will concentrate on the foreign policy aspects of the Radios and on alternative financing arrangements for them, I am inclined to think that this is little more than belated recognition of the foreign policy significance of these Radio operations.

I believe this significance is primary, as it must be with each and every program we conduct abroad. And in considering these reports and their generally favorable comments, I hope my colleagues and others will keep in mind the thoughts expressed only a couple of weeks ago following the President's dramatic trip to China. The culmination of the trip, the U.S.-China Communique of February 27, states for example:

-3-

"The United States supports individual freedom and social progress for all the peoples of the world, free of outside pressure or intervention."

In this same spirit, the Communique goes on to read:

"The United States believes that the effort to reduce tensions is served by improving communications between countries that have different ideologies so as to lessen the risks of confrontation through accident, miscalculation or misunderstanding. Countries should treat each other with mutual respect and be willing to compete peacefully, letting performance be the ultimate judge. No country should claim infallibility and each country should be prepared to re-examine its own attitudes for the common good."

It is interesting to contrast these sentiments with the objectives of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The Radio Free Europe report states for example:

"RFE's policy in its political broadcasts is to press for reform within the prevailing Communist system in East Europe...."

And the Radio Liberty study leaves no doubt as to the purpose of its broadcasts:

"Assuming the stance of a 'patriotic' Soviet communicator and acting on the democratic principle of a free press, RL identifies with what it believes to be the best interests of the Soviet peoples and speaks in their behalf, hoping that in the long run this effort will contribute to those forces seeking to bring about a democratic transformation of Soviet society. For, RL's ultimate goal is the peaceful democratization of the Soviet Union; and it holds to the belief that the best assurance for peace with Russia is through the diminution of Soviet totalitarianism and the growth of democracy."

Mr. President, if after one short week we can reach the kind of understanding with the People's Republic of China that would foreclose a "Radio Free China" aimed at reforming the Peking government, then I find it incomprehensible, after these years of direct contact with the Soviet Union, that we must continue to support a "Radio Liberty" whose objective is the "diminution of Soviet totalitarianism...."

I regret that the Library's reports do not come to grips with this kind of issue. Nor do they see any contradiction between these Radio operations and the Administration's "low profile" policy. Nor is there any mention of the Nixon Doctrine, the concept of "shared responsibility" and its possible application to Western European financial support for the Radios.

Rather what we are left with is two rather dreary commentaries on two very bureaucratic organizations whose common goal is to liberalize the governments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union by broadcasting "balanced news" to the peoples of these countries. The people, in turn, according to the theory, then pressure their respective governments for democratic reforms, and this, in turn, serves to create conditions for world peace.

Of course, the theory runs headlong into the brutal experiences of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and if there were any validity at all to the theory, I cannot believe that President Nixon, Dr. Kissinger and Secretary of State Rogers would have agreed to discard it so gingerly in the case of China. But they did, as the Joint Communique of February 27 states. And they did it for good reason: Such a theory, I believe, is based on nothing more than an arrogant belief that people around the world will act like we want them to act if we only tell them how.

Mr. President, the proper perspective on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty was perhaps best stated in a letter which I received recently from a retired foreign service officer, who devoted more than twenty years of his professional career to Eastern European and Communist affairs. He asked that I not reveal his name, but I would like to quote from his letter for the benefit of my colleagues:

"It seems clear to me, were there no RFE or Radio Liberty now in existence, that nobody would suggest that this would be the time to establish such a station. The pattern of our relations with the countries of Eastern Europe has evolved in such a manner, that no one would pretend to argue that our interests in that part of the world would be better served by setting up such a station now.

"The main argument for continuance of the station, then, is now the bureaucratic one: A large organization with an expensive staff now exists, and so must presumably continue to exist, even though the need for it (if there ever was such) has long since disappeared. But the staffs can be taken care of much more economically, with generous severance pay, than by prolonging the life of an unneeded station."

I think this is a very perceptive observation and one which serves full consideration, particularly by those who, up to this point, may have been exposed to only one side of this issue. I, of course, am persuaded

-5-

that the Radios ought to be liquidated, unless perhaps our European allies are willing to pick up their fair share of the financial burden that these Radios impose -- a burden which the American taxpayer would otherwise have to continue to bear alone.

In this connection, it might be helpful to include at this point in the Record a copy of my recent letter to Senators Percy and Humphrey, the principal sponsors of Senate Resolution 272.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the fact that last year the Committee on Foreign Relations was able to obtain from the Department of State a brief description of the arrangements made and mechanisms used by the Executive Branch to maintain policy control and direction of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I invite Senators and Congressmen who are interested in this information to look at it in the Committee's Capitol office S-116. I regret to say that it is available on a classified basis only, a restriction insisted upon by the Department of State.

No. 2

FOR P.M. RELEASE
February 17, 1972

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Statement by Senator J. W. Fulbright
on
Radio Free Europe & Radio Liberty

Mr. President:

One of the more troublesome issues which the Committee on Foreign Relations has wrestled with during the past year is the question of public funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. As a result of the Committee's consideration of this issue, I have developed some very decided views on the Radios and their activities, and I would like to share these views with my colleagues.

Senators will recall that these were the Radios financed by "dimes from school children" or so we were told over the years. As it turned out, however, the "dimes", amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, really came from the Central Intelligence Agency and were part of a fraud to dupe the taxpayers of the U.S. as well as the people of Eastern Europe into believing that the Radios were private organizations, dependent solely on private contributions.

Mr. President, the history of these Radios, particularly the covert funding and policy direction of them, provides, I think, an example -- a good example -- of how and why people lose faith in their government and their elected officials. Fundamentally, this is a matter of credibility and the public's expectations that its government is so structured that the "big lie" cannot be perpetuated indefinitely; that the separation of powers is a real safeguard, if not an immediate one; and that our system of checks and balances does, over a period of time at least, work much as the Founding Fathers said it would.

The case of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty indicates, I suppose, that given a long enough period of time, the checks and balances are there; the separation of powers does exist; and the "big lie" can be exposed.

- 2 -

While this case "proves" all of these things, I cannot help but think that it has, nevertheless, taken an exceptionally heavy toll in the peoples' faith and credibility in their government -- a faith and credibility already overtaxed by U-2 flights that we didn't know anything about; by an invasion at the Bay of Pigs that we weren't involved in; by Tonkin Gulf incidents that we were innocent of; and the list goes on and on. In South Vietnam we have learned about Korean soldiers being paid by the U.S. Government at much higher rates than U.S. soldiers; in Laos we have learned about CIA personnel dressed up in AID clothing; and in Cambodia we have learned about U.S. military advisers being transformed into "military equipment delivery teams."

But through all of this -- through all of the deception and the falsehoods heaped on the American public -- there was Radio Free Europe, keeping the "truth alive behind the Iron Curtain." Yes, despite the numbing realization of having been led down the primrose path on any number of major public issues -- the American public was told that it could point with pride to Radio Free Europe as a bastion of truth and freedom -- a symbol, although perhaps a fading one, of America's dedication to the dictum: "Know the truth and it shall make you free." And even if it was becoming more and more difficult to get the truth from our own Government here in the United States, the American public was assured that Radio Free Europe was at the ramparts fighting the deception and half-truths foisted upon the captive peoples of Eastern Europe by their governments. If we could not keep truth alive here, then at least we could keep it alive and well over there.

Who could ask for a nobler gesture?

Here was the American public, itself, fighting a rear guard action but willing, nevertheless, according to the public appeals, to take on the additional burden of making sure that Radio Free Europe broadcasts continued to penetrate the Iron Curtain with truth, freedom and justice.

And then, like awaking from an Orwellian dream, we learned one fine day that Radio Free Europe has also failed us; that it, too, was a product of the government's arcane imagination; that it, too, was a product of the U-2, Bay of Pigs, and Tonkin Gulf mentality; and that it, too, was a product of the government's willingness to deceive the American public.

In other words Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were simply part of a pattern -- a pattern of falsehood and deception; a pattern of fraud and deceit; a pattern of conspiracy to mislead not only the American people but anybody else who was willing to listen and follow.

But like most sordid episodes this, too, has a bright spot: The American public -- the man in the street, the one who was proselytized year after year to support Radio Free Europe -- he was never persuaded of the value or virtue of these Radio operations. With some of the information that has now come to light, we know that private contributions, which, in fact, were mostly from our giant corporations, provided only a fraction -- about 15 percent -- of the amount needed to fund Radio Free Europe's operations.

This genuine lack of popular interest and support indicates that the public, in its collective wisdom, knew that the promises made by the Radios were really beyond their scope and power; that despite their best intentions and noble causes, truth and freedom are indigenous and subjective issues and cannot be transferred from one people to another no matter how righteous the motivation, no matter how unselfish the purpose.

But, Mr. President, despite the public's "benign neglect" of the Radios or because of it, one Administration after another -- Democratic and Republican alike -- have over the last twenty years funded the Radios to the tune of almost one-half billion dollars. The covert funding has, in turn, been accompanied by policy controls and monitoring arrangements so as to insure compliance with official policy guidelines.

All of this indicates, beyond question, that the Radios still constitute an integral part of our foreign policy toward Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. And if the amount spent annually on this program is any guide to its importance -- then this is the most important program conducted by the U.S. Government in its relations with these nations. Indeed, the \$36.2 million requested for this fiscal year is not far below the total Voice of America budget of \$44 million, and it approximates the entire Educational and Cultural Exchange Program of \$40 million.

But unlike these other programs, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are never joined in the Administration's discussion of its policy toward Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The reason is fairly straight forward and it really boils down to this: The Administration wants an unofficial voice of the U.S. Government broadcasting within officially established guidelines to

-4-

these Communist countries. The reason for this is as Assistant Secretary of State Hillenbrand told the Committee on May 24, 1971: "...official government radios must take care to avoid the charge of interference in the internal affairs of other nations."

The implication, of course, is that "unofficial" radios, like Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, are not subject to the same diplomatic considerations or limitations; that they can do the "kind of job" that a VOA or BBC cannot do; that they can broadcast what the government wants to say unofficially without being held officially responsible for it.

Regardless of the label attached to the Radios, the fact is this activity, even if it entails nothing more than "straight news reporting", raises a number of foreign policy issues not the least of which is the extent of our meddling in the internal political affairs of other countries by means of directing and supporting broadcasting activities in behalf of political refugees.

If this activity is based on a viable policy, then perhaps some consideration ought to be given to establishing a "Radio Free Greece", or a "Radio Free China" or perhaps a "Radio Free Brazil." The governments of these countries enjoy a rather dubious reputation of strict censorship -- as do any number of other countries. And, yet, so far as I am aware, the Executive Branch does not fund similar broadcasting arrangements geared to "getting the truth through" to the citizens of these countries. In these cases, the Administration is content with Voice of America broadcasts.

If this is so, then why isn't the Administration content with VOA broadcasts to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union? Why the additional need for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty -- a need which costs the taxpayers more than \$35 million per year?

Mr. President, if the need for these Radio operations is as clear cut as Administration officials claim, why isn't there some recognition of it on the part of our NATO allies, who after all, are much closer to the situation than we are? Being so much closer to the "firing line", one would think they would be eager to support both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. But, of course, they are not; nor is there any indication that they can be talked into putting up some money to support these Radios.

Such an attitude on the part of our Western European allies ought to tell us something about our own policy; namely, that the

Radios are an anachronism and that we ought to have the courage to recognize they have outlived any usefulness they may have once had. The American public recognizes this, so do the Western Europeans. The time has come for our Government to recognize it too.

Mr. President, I submit these Radios should be given an opportunity to take their rightful place in the graveyard of cold-war relics.

CONFIDENTIAL

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Tuesday - 7 March 1972

Page 2

4. (Confidential - GLC) Mr. Houston, General Counsel, contacted us regarding the response which should be given by Secretary Rogers to the Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow if he is questioned about Chairman Fulbright's letter to the Department requesting various studies on the Radios. (Secretary Rogers is appearing before the Committee tomorrow in connection with Foreign Aid legislation.) It was agreed that the Secretary should indicate that updated material along the lines of his request has been forwarded to OMB for review and will then be given to the Committee. If the Secretary is pressed for a response about any Agency studies, he should indicate that he will refer the matter to CIA. Mr. Houston is handling this with [] of CA Staff. 25X1A

5. (Confidential - GLC) In following up on a call from Assistant Secretary of State Abshire, to Mr. Maury, I talked with his assistant, Mr. James Halmo. Mr. Halmo said Mr. Abshire was interested in knowing how many CIA studies had been conducted on the Radios. (Abshire wants this information in connection with Secretary Rogers' appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow.) I advised Halmo that our General Counsel was preparing a suggested response for the Secretary on this which would be passed from [] of CIA, to either Dick Davies or John Baker of the State Department. I urged Mr. Halmo to plug into that channel for guidance. 25X1A

6. (Confidential - GLC) Talked with Mr. John Goldsmith, on the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who said that at the Committee hearing this morning a question was put to Ambassador Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, about the possibility of funds for irregular forces in Laos being appropriated to the State Department which would be given by the Ambassador to a member of his country team for payment. Sullivan said this posed a new proposition which he would want to check with his legal people and then make a response to the Committee. (See Mr. Maury's Memo for the Record.)

STATOTHR

STATOTHR

7. (Confidential - JMM) Called Representative James Cleveland (R., N.H.) and reported on the results of my trip to New Hampshire regarding the [] case. He seemed well satisfied. []

CONFIDENTIAL